

Appl. No. 10/709,102
Amdt. dated October 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 15, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Uchiyama (US 5,829,855).

5 Response:

10 The applicant would like to point out the patentable differences between claim 1 and Uchiyama. Claim 1 contains the limitation of "a light shield, mounted between the reflector and the screen to block scattered beams that are to be projected onto the screen". That is, the light shield 25 serves the purpose of blocking light beams that will be projected on the screen 24.

15 On the other hand, the cover 18 taught by Uchiyama does not block light beams that will reach the screen 3. Uchiyama teaches in Fig.1 and Fig.2 a light source 8 surrounded by a reflector 9 for reflecting the emitted light downwards. Thus, the cover 18 does not block any of the light emitted by the light source 8 from being projected on the screen 3. The cover 18 is merely provided as a means of accessing the light source 8 for changing the light source 8 when it burns out, and does not have any light shielding functionality.

20 Moreover, Uchiyama teaches in column 5, lines 26-30 that some of the light emitted from the light source 8 leaks out of the light source housing 17, and therefore does not reach the screen 3 since the leaked light does not pass through the relay lens 11. Uchiyama does not teach that the cover 18 blocks leaked light emitted from the light source 8, since the reflector 9 would already serve this purpose.

25 For these reasons, Uchiyama does not anticipate all limitations recited in claim 1 since the cover 18 does not block light beams that are to be projected onto the

Appl. No. 10/709,102
Amdt. dated October 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 15, 2005

screen 3. Claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

2. Introduction to new claims 7-12:

5 New claim 7 is based on the original claim 1, and contains additional limitations for more clearly defining the present invention. Claim 7 contains the limitation of "a light shield, mounted between the reflector and the screen for blocking scattered beams reflected by the reflector from being projected onto the screen". Therefore, claim 7 more clearly recites that the light shield 25 blocks light
10 beams that are reflected by the reflector 22.

 On the other hand, Uchiyama does not teach that the cover 18 blocks light beams reflected by the reflector 15b. During normal use, the cover 18 covers a top surface 17a of the light source housing unit 17, and would not be able to block any
15 light reflected by the reflector 15b. For these reasons, new claim 7 is patentably distinct from the Uchiyama patent.

 Claims 8-12 are drafted based on original claims 2-6, and no new matter has been added through any of the new claims.
20

 New claim 9 further limits the position of the light shield to being under the screen along an optical path between the reflector and the screen. On the other hand, Uchiyama does not teach that the cover 18 is disposed along an optical path between the reflector 15b and the screen 3 during normal use.
25

 In addition, claims 8-12 are dependent on claim 7, and should be allowed if claim 7 is allowed. Acceptance of new claims 7-12 is respectfully requested. In view of the above statements in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests

Appl. No. 10/709,102
Amdt. dated October 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 15, 2005

that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

5 Winston Hsu

Date: October 6, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

10 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)